

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully note that the previous amendment dated 28 September 2006 incorrectly labeled claims 25-27 and 29-36 as “PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED” when these claims should have been labeled “ORIGINAL”. Applicants apologize for this error.

Election/Restrictions

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s argument that claims 37-56 should be withdrawn, as these claims are covered in the same art areas as claims 25-36, and thus it would not have been a burden on the Examiner to examine all of the claims. However, Applicants respectfully note that the Examiner’s arguments for restriction do not apply to new claims 57-76. (Note that new claims 57-76 use the same text as claims 37-56 with only the claim numbering intentionally changed.) For example, the Examiner argued that claims 37-44 were directed to a resource that has endpoint circuitry – dependent claim 30 also is directed to a resource that has endpoint circuitry. Also, the Examiner argued that claims 45-56 were directed to a system that does not have additional steering logic – claim 25 no longer has additional steering logic. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to examine all of the presently pending claims.

Claim Rejections under Watkins – 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 25-36 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watkins et al. (US 2003/0182492). Claim 25 expressly states “a resource coupled to the system bus and useable by the first bus master and the second bus master, wherein the resource is configurable to be owned by at least one of the first bus master and the second bus master, wherein the resource establishes a communication path between the resource and at least one of the first bus master and the second bus master, wherein the communication path is used to transfer at least one additional signal between the resource and the at least one of the first bus master and the second bus master, and wherein the communication path is determined by the resource”. Claim 34

expressly states “establishing a communication path between a resource coupled to the system bus and at least one of a plurality of bus masters coupled to the system bus, wherein the communication path is determined and controlled by the resource”. (See e.g., Specification, page 9, lines 1-7).

In the Examiner’s Office Action dated 12 June 2007, the Examiner admitted that Watkins does not specifically disclose a data processing system wherein the communication path is determined by the resource. In addition, claim 25 now has language stating that the resource establishes as well as determines a communication path between the resource and at least one of the first bus master and the second bus master, and claim 34 now has language stating that the communication path is controlled by as well as determined by the resource. Watkins does not teach or even suggest that the communication path is established or controlled by the resource (per the Examiner, device 30 in FIG. 7 of Watkins teaches the resource). In fact, Watkins teaches away from this by teaching that the bridge 12, not device 30, establishes and controls the communication path. (See Watkins, paragraphs [0014], [0016], [0017], [0023], and [0025].)

One advantage of the claimed invention over Watkins is that a direct communication can be made (see FIG. 1, conductors 101, 102) between the resource 100 and the bus masters 12, 14. Referring to FIG. 7 of Watkins, no such direct communications between device 30 and processing sets 14 and 16 can take place in Watkins. Watkins must use a bridge 12 to act as an intermediate interface and route all communications between device 30 and processing sets 14 and 16. Any time circuitry is added (e.g. bridge 12) between communicating blocks of circuitry (e.g. between the device 30 and processing sets 14 and 16), one of the negative effects that may result is that the intermediate circuitry (e.g. bridge 12) can act to slow the actual communication. By removing the need for bridge 12, the claimed invention may operate more efficiently.

The dependent claims are allowable for at least the reasons given above for the independent claims.

The Office Action contains numerous statements characterizing the claims, the Specification, and the prior art. Regardless of whether such statements were

addressed by Applicants, Applicants refuse to subscribe to any of these statements, unless expressly indicated by Applicants.

Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully solicited. Please contact Susan C. Hill if there are any issues regarding this communication or the current Application.

If Applicant has overlooked any additional fees, or if any overpayment has been made, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit or debit Deposit Account 503079, Freescale Semiconductor, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Freescale Semiconductor, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: 23125

By: 
HILL, SUSAN C.
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 35,896
Telephone: (512) 996-6839
Fax No.: (512) 996-6854